

Announcements—
Anterior Park—Theatre—Matinee.
Anterior Park—Theatre—Matinee.
Bijou Opera House—The Studio—Matinee.
Booth's Theatre—Dinner at Round Table—Matinee.
Bromell—Matinee—Broadway and 80th St.
Drama Theatre—Piano Recital—Matinee.
Grand Opera House—Matinee.
Hervey's Music Garden—Matthew Price—Matinee.
Hervey's Little Theatre—Fitzwilliam Price—Matinee.
Hervey's Little Theatre—Anterior Park—Matinee.
San Francisco Mechanics' Auditorium—Matinee.
Standard Theatre—Patterson—Matinee.
Studio Theatre—Opening, the Waterman.
Theatre Comique—sovereign—Matinee.
Two Pastors—Theatre—Variety.
Union Square Theatre—The Louis—Matinee.
Wallack's Theatre—The Student for Society—Matinee.
Windham Theatre—Fetes in Ireland—Matinee.

Guitreau's Trial.

Mr. DAVIDSON concluded his speech against GUITREAU to the jury yesterday, and today Col. RUM will begin the summing up for the defense. He promised not to take more than half a day, and he will be followed by Mr. SCOVILLE whose speech will last several days. GUITREAU's interruptions yesterday were more frequent and persistent than ever. He declared at the start that he withdrew any injurious remarks he had made against Mr. DAVIDSON, and at the end thanked him for making such a fight speech against him. When Mr. DAVIDSON quoted testimony which GUITREAU had contradicted as it came from the witness' lips, GUITREAU again declared that it was untrue. He accused Mr. DAVIDSON of talking only for money, which would burn in his pocket. The court room was densely crowded, and after a woman had failed GUITREAU suggested to the court that fresh air was needed in the room, a suggestion which was acted upon.

The Law Officers of the State and the Elevated Railroads.

Our esteemed and able contemporary the *New York Times* is doing good public service by the careful watch it keeps over the management of the elevated railroads in this city. An article which it printed a fortnight ago on this subject has attracted attention throughout the State. The facts published tend strongly to show that two or three well-known speculators have acquired control of the elevated railroads by artfully avoiding themselves of legal proceedings in the courts, and other measures designed to depress the stock of the Manhattan Company, to which both lines were leased, and by which both lines were operated. When the price of the stock was low enough to suit them, according to this account, they bought it in large amounts; and then, by discontinuing their suits and reducing the moribund corporation from the burden of an enormous contract, they restored it to solvency, and derived vast benefit from the transaction by the consequent rise in the value of the stock which they had acquired from the disgraced holders at the lowest figures.

Among those most prominently concerned in the legal proceedings which appear thus to have been utilized by some of the parties for purposes of speculative gain, were Mr. HAMILTON WARD, the Attorney-General of the State, and the Hon. THOMAS R. WESTBROOK, one of the Justices of the Supreme Court in the Third Judicial District. The *Times* comes to the conclusion that they were the conscious instruments of JAY GOULD and his associates in breaking down the Manhattan Company, and throwing the elevated railroad corporations into the hands of a clique of schemers.

Yesterday that journal stated the case against them in these words:

"The allegations are that the late Attorney-General was a party to a plan and shaped up not only himself but his friends here and went to Justice WARD with a new one, which precisely suited the purposes of the speculators; that WARD, in his office, in the hands of receivers on the creditable ground of insolvency alone, and apparently in the interest of the corporation, at once suggested that the stock should be sold at a low price so as to bring it into a state fit to facilitate the purchase of it by Gould and his associates."

Of course, European countries have the advantage of us in the matter of wages. Their furnaces may also be nearer the raw materials than ours. But so far as concerns the processes of manufacture employed, Mr. SWANKE has no doubt of our superiority. "Our blast-furnace practice is the best in the world. Our Bessemer steel and Bessemer rails was greater than that of Great Britain even. We turned out 1,247,335 gross tons of steel of all kinds, 64,664 tons being crucible steel. It was not until 1844 that we began to roll any other kind of rails than scrap rails. In 1850 we rolled 1,305,212 gross tons of rails, nearly two-thirds of them being steel, and almost three-quarters of them T rails.

Four years ago the Democratic party was inspired by the Jeffersonian spirit, and arrayed upon Jeffersonian principles, by the greatest popular leader and the greatest political philosopher since JEFFERSON himself. The result is known. That victory was snatched away by traitors; but a few thousand Jeffersonian clubs, organized in every part of the country, and linked together by proper ties, would make very sure that another national triumph should not be lost in that way.

Make Your Ground Solid.

The bench of the United States Circuit Court in the eighth circuit to become an Instructor of youth at the Law School of Columbia College in this city.

Is it not probable that such aid as the official and judicial action in these cases afforded to the combination of speculators was rendered needless perhaps, but without any intention of evil? We certainly should prefer to believe so.

Our Vast Production of Iron and Steel.

The remarkable growth of the iron industry of the United States during the ten years from 1870 to 1880 is shown by the statistics of our iron and steel production collected for the tenth census by Mr. JAMES M. SWANKE. Exactly how great that growth was is shown in the following table:

	1870.	1880.
Capital invested.	\$20,722,844	\$121,722,671
Value of products.	\$10,657,080	\$73,006,215
Weight of products.	1,000,000,000	1,800,000,000
Total in value.	\$10,657,080	\$63,450,280

It will be observed that, while the weight of the products was nearly twice as much in 1880 as in 1870, their value increased only about forty-three per cent., and the value of the raw material used was only forty-one per cent. greater. This disproportion is easily explained. The prices of iron were high in 1870 owing to the premium on gold, which averaged fifteen per cent. throughout the year, and in 1880 they were lower. Moreover, during the decade there was a wonderful development, both mechanical and scientific, of our iron and steel industries. The consequences was that the great increase of production was rendered possible.

The growth of the iron business has been most marked during the last quarter of a century. Indeed, previous to 1850 we produced only a small, almost insignificant quantity of pig iron and cast iron. Fifty years ago our blast-furnace practice had scarcely progressed since the colonial days. In 1850 it was deemed a great thing for a single furnace to turn out 1,000 tons of pig iron in a year. In 1880 we had several furnaces which could each make 1,000 tons a month, and in 1881 we had one whose production was 224 tons a day, 1,357 a week, and 5,588 a month. In 1850 we produced of pig iron and cast iron 921,223 gross tons, and in 1880 more than fourfold that quantity, or 3,835,410 gross tons.

But the growth of our steel production is even more remarkable. Fifty years ago we did not make one pound of crucible steel of the best quality, and very little steel of any kind was manufactured. In 1850 our production of Bessemer steel and Bessemer rails was greater than that of Great Britain even. We turned out 1,247,335 gross tons of steel of all kinds, 64,664 tons being crucible steel. It was not until 1844 that we began to roll any other kind of rails than scrap rails. In 1850 we rolled 1,305,212 gross tons of rails, nearly two-thirds of them being steel, and almost three-quarters of them T rails.

At a time when powerful tendencies are at work to subvert the original character of our government—to break down the limitations of power established by the constitution—to centralize the action and influence of the government in the hands of a governing class, using machinery of government as a corrupting power in the elections, and then, through legislation and administration in the interests of the few, to sustain the many—the present example of such a man as Mr. JONES cannot be often invoked.

The formation of societies which can act as centres of discussion, and as schools for the propagation of the pure principles of the fathers of the republic, is a measure of great service to the people and to mankind.

Four years ago the Democratic party was inspired by the Jeffersonian spirit, and arrayed upon Jeffersonian principles, by the greatest popular leader and the greatest political philosopher since JEFFERSON himself. The result is known. That victory was snatched away by traitors; but a few thousand Jeffersonian clubs, organized in every part of the country, and linked together by proper ties, would make very sure that another national triumph should not be lost in that way.

Make Your Ground Solid.

In such an open proceeding as a ballot the Tammany men would much rather vote for the party with whom they have always had the greater apparent affiliation. They would rather vote for Democrats, but the important men on the ticket must be Tammany men.

The Tammany men were elected as Democrats. Before the Legislature met it was thought the Democrats would have a majority, and when the two houses were elected as Democrats the Republicans had to nominate their candidates. The Tammany men were elected as Democrats. The two houses were elected as Democrats.

Yesterday that journal stated the case against them in these words:

"The allegations are that the late Attorney-General was a party to a plan and shaped up not only himself but his friends here and went to Justice WARD with a new one, which precisely suited the purposes of the speculators; that WARD, in his office, in the hands of receivers on the creditable ground of insolvency alone, and apparently in the interest of the corporation, at once suggested that the stock should be sold at a low price so as to bring it into a state fit to facilitate the purchase of it by Gould and his associates."

In considering these allegations, we desire at the outset to recall the fact that THE SUN was the first to condemn the practice of holding court in private offices, and to protest the evil which would flow from it.

The first question presented concerning Mr. WARD and Judge WISCONSIN relates to the legality of their action. Did either of them, so far as appears, do anything which was unlawful? That is the answer to this inquiry must be in the negative, is sufficiently apparent from the guarded language of our esteemed contemporary. We will assume, therefore, that the history of the litigations affords no evidence of any illegal exercise of official or judicial authority.

We come next to the question of propriety. Here, on the other hand, it is equally clear that there was a disregard of the plain rules of conduct which ought to control those charged with the administration of justice. The Attorney-General should not have abandoned the suit he began here, simply because he met with an unexpected rebuff from some of the Judges in this judicial district; and the Judge should not have held court in anybody's private office, whether of counsel, or party, or citizen stranger.

Finally, there is the question of motive. Mr. WARD, in his published interview, has explained why he discontinued the suit in New York and commenced another in the Third Judicial District. The first action was based on several grounds in addition to the allegations that the Manhattan Company was insolvent. The General Term here intimated a doubt as to whether the cause of action had not been improperly joined in a single complaint. Forgetting delay if this objection should be insisted on, the Attorney-General deemed it best to have his proceeding on an averment of disloyalty only, which he felt safe of being able to establish on the trial; and it was not his fault, he submits, that the elevated railroad companies arranged among themselves to make the defendant solvent before the cause could be tried. He relies for leaving this difficult appearance to have been an阴谋 of the interference of Judge BRADY in granting a stay of proceedings which was of doubtful validity, but which prevented Mr. Justice DIXON from appointing a receiver in the original suit.

The importance of unworthy motives to Judge WISCONSIN appears to be founded not so much on any spaniel rendered by him in the course of the litigation, as on the appointment of receivers of the Manhattan Company who are alleged to have been "plainly in the interest of the corrupt combination." These receiver were JOHN F. BULLOCK and ANDREW L. HENRICKS. Of the fitness of Mr. HENRICKS we know nothing; but we are indeed surprised that unscrupulous contemporaries should have formed such an estimate of the character of Mr. DILLON, who was for twenty years or more an honored Judge in the West, and left

the bench of the United States Circuit Court in the eighth circuit to become an Instructor of youth at the Law School of Columbia College in this city.

Is it not probable that such aid as the official and judicial action in these cases afforded to the combination of speculators was rendered needless perhaps, but without any intention of evil? We certainly should prefer to believe so.

Our Vast Production of Iron and Steel.

The remarkable growth of the iron industry of the United States during the ten years from 1870 to 1880 is shown by the statistics of our iron and steel production collected for the tenth census by Mr. JAMES M. SWANKE. Exactly how great that growth was is shown in the following table:

	1870.	1880.
Capital invested.	\$20,722,844	\$121,722,671
Value of products.	\$10,657,080	\$73,006,215
Weight of products.	1,000,000,000	1,800,000,000
Total in value.	\$10,657,080	\$63,450,280

It will be observed that, while the weight of the products was nearly twice as much in 1880 as in 1870, their value increased only about forty-three per cent., and the value of the raw material used was only forty-one per cent. greater. This disproportion is easily explained.

The prices of iron were high in 1870 owing to the premium on gold, which averaged fifteen per cent. throughout the year, and in 1880 they were lower. Moreover, during the decade there was a wonderful development, both mechanical and scientific, of our iron and steel industries. The consequences was that the great increase of production was rendered possible.

Certainly this is not a fit time, with these astounding figures staring the country in the face, to start a civil pension system, even if there was no other objection against it. But the thing is wrong in itself, and it belongs to that class of schemes which are gradually undermining free government and are reaching out to an imperial system. Mr. ARTHUR's bill, and every proposition of a like character, or looking forward to new life pensions, ought to be stamped out at the very start, or, as Col. BENTON used to say, "to be killed stone dead, sir."

Democratic Societies.

Mr. GEORGE M. DALLAS of Philadelphia, whose character, abilities, and public services entitle him to a respectful hearing, writes to a Jeffersonian Democratic Association in Pennsylvania as follows:

"The principles of Democracy are immutable. New issues constantly present themselves; new principles never. The Democratic party is a party of principles, not of issues. Its opponent is a party of issues, not of principles. It is a party of classes, not of individuals. Its members are not bound by the strictures of any creed, but are free to act as they please. They are not bound by any dogma, nor by any dogmatical authority. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it off the board. The bill, however, remains subject to reconsideration by the authority of the same officer. All that is necessary to remove it altogether is that President ARTHUR should so order. But such an order from him would not carry weight with it. It would not obliterate the sentence, but it would not bring it